Javits Swings Toward Preventive War, P. 2

Behind A Press Blackout: 14 Democratic Senators In Letter to Ike Question Arms Give-Away, See Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 31 AUGUST 10, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Good News for All Mankind

The coming exchange of visits by Khrushchev and Eisenhower is good news for mankind. We believe the Russian will prove a hit in this country, and that the President will get a hero's welcome in the Soviet Union. The issues between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. are terribly complicated, have been rendered more so by those with an interest in continued tension, and are now tangled beyond comprehension. There will be a satisfying symbolism all the earth's millions can understand when the Russian leader and the American President shake hands on the steps of the White House. We applaud Mr. Eisenhower's announcement that the visit will not be for negotiations but for "informal talks" and "an exchange of views." The first necessity is the creation of a better atmosphere. Relaxation of tension will itself make easier the discovery of solutions. Above all, it is necessary for America and Russia to discover that they are both inhabited by human beings not abstract monsters known as "Communists" and "capitalists." For this purpose Khrushchev, a one-man travelling circus and permanent presidential campaign, should prove most effective; he has worked hard to end a glowering Stalinism at home and abroad and deserves praise for it.

Adenauer Being By-Passed

In the decision to have the exchange, credit here must go first of all to Mr. Eisenhower. History will see the death of John Foster Dulles as a turning point. Mr. Dulles had long vetoed a Nixon trip to Russia, and a Khrushchev visit here. With his death, the ice began to melt. Mr. Eisenhower's eight years in office would be historic—all else would be forgiven—if the President who began by ending the war in Korea finished by laying the foundations for peaceful co-existence with the Soviet Union. There were some interesting revelations in the President's special press conference last Monday. They disclosed that "some time back" Mr. Eisenhower suggested to the State Department that we try "to melt a little bit of the ice" in our relations with Russia, and that the President himself in early July "initiated" the correspondence that led to the invitation for the Khrushchev visit. Apparently even Nixon did not know about this correspondence until the eve of his own trip, for Mr. Eisenhower says he told the Vice President about it "so that you will not be astonished or surprised and feel let down by your government." It is also clear that the President did not wait for an approval which Bonn and perhaps Paris among the allied capitals might not have given, for he told the press "the heads of state were notified just recently about this impending visit, and some of them have been able to answer." When this is added to the President's remark that "somewhere along the line" he would see Adenauer, it is evident that the Bonn-Washington axis is not what it used to be when Dulles was alive.

By Contrast With Nixon

"Governor Rockefeller avoided making even courtesy calls on the two Russian dignitaries who recently visited New York, Vice Premiers Anastas I. Mikoyan and Frol R. Kozlov. He turned down an invitation to the opening of the Soviet exhibit in New York even though it was attended by the President and the Vice President. And clearly he does not share the enthusiasm demonstrated by many U.S. businessmen in entertaining the Soviet visitors as though they were close friends."

—W. H. Lawrence in New York Times Aug. 4 from Puerto Rico the day Khrushchev visit announced

The British have played a crucial role in all this. Ever since the death of Stalin and Churchill's visit here in 1953, the British have been trying to bring about a Russo-American settlement. Churchill's desire for a summit meeting was frustrated. Eden brought about a reluctant summit meeting in 1955 only to have its results undercut by Dulles in the Foreign Ministers' Conference which followed it at Geneva. Dulles had done his best to discourage Macmillan's one-man voyage of exploration to Moscow which paved the way for the exchange now announced. Myopically considered, this new summit like the last reflects the requirements of British domestic politics; this has been the big talking point in Washington—that a summit was necessary to defeat the Labor party. Indeed we see by the London *Sunday Times* (Aug. 2) that the Conservatives may hold the General Election on October 15 or 22 while the exchanges for which they can claim credit are still going on. But the longer view is that Britain, which needed Russo-American tension after the war to obtain American aid, now sees only certain disaster in the drift to war and in a continued arms race beyond its resources. In Britain, as elsewhere peace is the issue which wins elections.

Mr. Nixon sees that here, and spoke in Moscow in one world tones that recalled Willkie and Wallace. Between him and his rival Rockefeller a gulf is opening up. Nixon has made himself the advocate of co-existence; Rockefeller of civilian fallout shelters. One says there is now no alternative to peace; the other that we can wage nuclear war and save enough people to start over again. Both parties are split wide open. Rockefeller stands with Truman and Acheson in wanting the cold war stepped up. Eisenhower and Nixon agree with Democrats like Stevenson, Harriman and Humphrey in wanting the arms race cut down. The old cold war bi-partisanship is over and a real debate on foreign policy is shaping up at last.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Civil Defense Stressed to Make "First Strike" and "Stronger" Foreign Policy Possible

Javits Swinging Over to Rockefeller-Holifield Preventive War View

Javits seems to be the latest member of the Senate to be swept along in the preventive war undertow created on the Republican side by Governor Rockefeller's influence and on the Democratic by Congressman Chet Holifield of California. His speech in the Senate July 29 is disturbing. It was made in answer to a speech by Senator Young of Ohio on July 27 deriding the Rockefeller compulsory shelter program as part of a civil defense "hoax and fraud," particularly for an apartment house city like New York where (Young said) "someone living on the 20th floor would probably, from the time the first warning is given, get down to about the 6th floor before an atomic warhead would explode. . . ."

Protecting Civilians or Gambling With Their Lives?

Javits urged "personal consideration to the protection of millions of the innocent and defenseless whose lives would be endangered in the event of conflict." But the emphasis of his speech is not on the prevention of thermonuclear war, the only sure way to protect people (see boxes on this page), but on civil defense *as a mechanism for making feasible a policy of initiating thermonuclear war.*

Thus Javits quoted with approval a passage from a recent civil defense report by the Holifield subcommittee of House Government Operations which said, "From the enemy's standpoint, a strong civil defense in the United States would mean first of all that our strategic strike forces will be used if necessary, despite the consequences of a *return* blow by the enemy." (Italics added.)

This means we would strike first. The Lebanese-Iraqi crisis like the earlier Indo-Chinese crisis of 1954 showed how wrong our military and intelligence estimates could be; in such situations we might easily ignite the world. Javits followed this up with similar quotations from the (Herman Kahn) Rand Corporation studies and the Rockefeller Brothers report (see box at top of col. 2). These reports are concerned not so much with protecting the civilian population as with gambling that even if millions died enough could be saved to make victory meaningful.

Implicit in the calculations of the preventive war bloc—though little understood by the public—is a willingness to write off what they call Country A and concentrate on saving what they call Country B. Country A is made up of the large cities where they acknowledged that no protection is possible against the volcanic radioactive hell into which an attack would convert our cities. Country B is made up of rural and small towns distant enough from these urban areas so that their only problem would be heavy fallout. The shelter program is designed only to deal with the problem in such regions. New York City would, of course, be written off.

CIA Chief Seems to Differ With Rockefeller

"If relations with the Soviet bloc ever reach the showdown stage, the edge of difference, which may be very fine, may well depend on the strength of the competing wills. This in turn is likely to reflect the relative vulnerabilities. . . . An enemy who felt confident that he could disrupt and disorganize our society while preserving the substance of his own might be tempted to launch an all-out blow. Conversely the ability to afford reasonable protection to our population may enable us to act with firmness and resolution in time of crisis."

—Rockefeller Bros. Report, "International Security: The Military Aspect" quoted by Javits July 29.

". . . the theory that either of the great nuclear powers could destroy the other, without the attacker himself being devastated, is not, I believe, subscribed to on either side of the Iron Curtain. The threat of mutual nuclear destruction is a nightmare that cannot be dismissed, but even though international communism expects to gain the world, it does not wish to acquire a world in ashes."

—Allen W. Dulles, director of Central Intelligence, concluding the National Strategy Seminar for Reserve Officers at the National War College July 24 (text at page A 6468, Congressional Record July 27).

13 Famous City Planners Say Ban on A-Bombs and Tests Only Effective Defense Warn Against Creating False Sense of Security in Shelter Programs

"We, as members of the American Institute of Planners, believe that our professional responsibilities now include the urgent need to help protect our urban communities from total destruction by nuclear weapons and radioactive pollution.

"We recognize that our ability to effectively reduce the vulnerability of cities has been nullified by the awful increase in the destructive power of nuclear weapons during the past decade. We have no faith in the concept of a 'limited war' which would spare our cities—we agree with our military leaders that nuclear weapons of indescribably great power would inevitably be used to destroy our cities, should a major war break out.

"We assert that there is no longer any possibility of adequate civil defense against a major nuclear war, and we assert that the fall-out shelter programs are utterly incapable of providing even a modicum of protection against a determined enemy. We believe that such policies tend to lull the country into a false sense of security about the effects of nuclear war by continuing to hold out hope for survival where there is none.

"We recognize that the positive steps to be taken to protect our cities from nuclear destruction lie in political action, but as professional planners we feel compelled to assert the following technical judgments:

"1. That the present civil defense and fall-out shelter programs are incapable of protecting American cities and their citizens in the event of a nuclear war.

"2. That the only way to protect our cities against nuclear attack is through negotiation for the cessation of testing and use of nuclear weapons.

"We urge that the Board of Governors of the American Institute of Planners consider a resolution and appropriate action with respect to these points at the forthcoming national conference in Seattle (July-August 1959). We also urge the Board of Governors to appoint an official committee to report on further steps the profession should take to help insure that the destructive potential of nuclear explosions and radioactive pollutions are never used against our communities."

—Charles S. Ascher, Frederick Bigger, Hans Blumenfeld, Henry S. Churchill, Louis P. Dolbeare, Eugene Henry Klaber, Albert Mayer, Lewis Mumford, Flavel Shurtleff, Clarence S. Stein, Walter Thabit, Robert Weinberg, Roger Willcox.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Heavy Protest Mail Forces Token Gesture; Still Not Too Late to Suspend Nuclear Pacts

Senators Led by Humphrey Express Misgivings to Ike Over Atomic Give-Away

We reprint below the full text of an exchange of letters between 14 Democratic Senators and the President expressing misgivings about the new nuclear give-away agreements. We reprint these letters here because:

(1) The text is available nowhere else. Indeed, except for a news story by Joseph P. Lash in the *New York Post* July 31, the day the letters were released, no other newspaper we have seen mentioned them. The *New York Times* did not carry the news. Neither did the Washington papers. This is part of a continued press blackout.

(2) Despite the press blackout, there has been a greater outpouring of mail on these agreements, particularly on nuclear arms for West Germany, than on any comparable issue in years. The exchange of letters reflects the growing concern in the country and the rising pressure on Congress.

Say-It-Ain't-So Letter

(3) The letter by the Democratic Senators was designed to take them off the hook but the position taken is so weak it looks as if it might have been framed by Kennedy, the weakest of its signers. In vulgar, brief but accurate terms, it might be termed a say-it-ain't-so-letter.

It is obvious that to rearm West Germany with nuclear weapons will be a fatal obstacle to peaceful reunification of the Reich. Russia will not relinquish East Germany to a Bonn armed with atomic weapons, allied with NATO and equipped for revenge. For these Senators to ask the President to say that the agreements "in no way prejudice the reunification of Germany" is to ask the White House to give them an excuse for their inaction by making an untrue declaration.

It is also obvious that one does not make international control of atomic weapons easier by training more nations in their use and stockpiling such weapons in those countries for their armies in the event of war. The Senators ask the President for a declaration which would show our "peaceful intentions . . . and our willingness . . . for the reduction and control of nuclear weapons." Our actions speak louder than any such words. The letter got the brushoff.

(4) The joint statement, the brushoff and the pressure may stiffen Senator Humphrey's position to the point where he might do in the Senate what the insurgents led by Meyer of Vermont did in the House, and force a vote by an amendment to the foreign aid bill.

Humphrey could offer an amendment suspending the use of foreign aid funds for this purpose until after current negotiations at Geneva on Berlin and on nuclear testing were over. Certainly with a summit meeting in prospect at which progress on disarmament might be made, is it not folly to tie our hands by these agreements? It is true that they have certain legalistic loopholes which might be utilized by the President to make them a dead-letter but not without a charge of bad faith by the other parties to them.

The Senate has not yet held hearings on the foreign aid bill. The bill may not come before it until the end of August. If pressure is stepped up on the Senate, there is still a fighting chance to force a debate, perhaps even to suspend the agreements. Now's the time to write your Senator.

Press Time Bulletin

According to the Aug. 2-3 issue of Le Monde, 30 leading French scientists have appealed to their government urging it to seek an agreement forbidding the testing, manufacture, stockpiling and use of atomic weapons.

Text of the Letters Exchanged With the President on Nuclear Sharing Pacts

July 25

My dear Mr. President:

We write to you regarding the proposed agreements between the United States and seven NATO countries on the transfer of United States nuclear information and equipment.

As you are aware, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, specifies that agreements on nuclear sharing go into effect unless Congress, within 60 days after the agreements have been submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, acts by concurrent resolution to reject the agreements.

Although we have misgivings with respect to the United States entering into these agreements at this particular time, we have concluded that the problems involved in these agreements cannot be solved by the Senate and House passing a resolution of rejection.

A number of people in this country and abroad, nevertheless, question the necessity and wisdom of these agreements on sharing nuclear weapons material and data. In view of this concern here and abroad, we respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that serious consideration be given to the issuance of a declaration of policy by you on behalf of the United States. We have in mind a declaration which would clearly show that the dictates of military policy do not take precedence over U. S. political and diplomatic policies. It could reassure our people that the agreements in no way preclude the United States from entering into agreements in the future with the Soviet Union and other nations concerning the control and reduction of armaments, that they in no way prejudice the reunification of Germany, and that they in no way bind the United States to continue to supply the recipient governments with nuclear information and materials if this action should be prohibited by international agreements dealing with arms control arrangements in Europe or agreement on the reunification of Germany.

Such a declaration by you or by all the governments to be parties to the agreements would demonstrate that military decisions are subordinate to larger political and diplomatic objectives. It would also indicate the peaceful intentions of the United States and our willingness at any time to consider proposals for the solution of outstanding political differences such as the reunification of Germany and for the reduction and control of nuclear weapons and other armaments.

Respectfully,

Senators Humphrey, Carroll, Church, McCarthy, Morse, Hart, Neuberger, Clark, Kennedy, Proxmire, Young, Williams, Muskie and Mansfield.

July 28

Dear Senator Humphrey:

I assure you, and request that you transmit this assurance to your co-signers of the letter you sent me on July 25, that your communication will receive the earnest consideration of the Executive Branch. I shall also see that you are further advised.

I appreciate this expression of your convictions on a most important subject.

Sincerely,

Dwight D. Eisenhower

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Basic Question Still Is: Can A Free Society Police Against Dangerous Thoughts?

Court of Appeals Falls Back on Guilt by Association in SACB Case

The U. S. Court of Appeals here has just handed down its third decision in the case of the *Communist Party vs. the Subversive Activities Control Board.* This tests the constitutionality of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which Congress passed over Truman's veto, and is one of the most long drawn out cases in the history of our courts. It began nine years ago. It will reach the U. S. Supreme Court for the second time on appeal next Fall, and it looks as if it will be sent back for a fourth round in the Court of Appeals before the Supreme Court passes on the basic constitutional issue. The basic constitutional issue is whether in a free society the government may label certain ideas as dangerous, force those who disseminate them to register with a government board, and mark their publications and radio broadcasts as "subversive." Its basic assumption is the basic assumption of all totalitarian regimes, whether Fascist or Communist, that the government has a right to act as a policeman in the field of ideas.

In one sense the protracted appeals represent a kind of "cooling off" operation in disposing of an act which (as the Mundt-Nixon bill) was long opposed by many of the most conservative lawyers of our time, failed year after year of passage and only achieved enactment in the wake of anti-Communist hysteria after the Korean war began. The chances are that the law will finally be declared unconstitutional and that our highest court will uphold the reasoning of Judge Bazelon's original dissent on the Court of Appeals in 1954. Judge Bazelon argued that under the Fifth amendment the government cannot force a man or an organization to register as Communist or Communist controlled since this would open the way to incrimination under various laws, including the Smith Act, which penalizes advocates of revolutionary ideas.

When Informers Have to Take the Stand

So far, the Supreme Court has passed only on questions of evidence. Here the byproducts of this long litigation have been most useful. Since this is a criminal proceeding subject to all the traditional safeguards of due process, the government had to put its professional Communist informants in the witness stand where they were subjected to cross-examination and to judicial scrutiny. There were not so-called "casual informants" but those FBI professionals whom some liberals would protect from confrontation in loyalty-security cases. The result has been to deflate one after another of the government's most famous informers as unrealiable, perjurious or psychotic.

The testimony of three, Manning Johnson, Paul Crouch and Harvey Matusow, were stricken entirely from the record. The testimony of four others, Scarletto, Cummings, Honig and Mrs. Markward was stricken in part. This new round of litigation involves the reliability of Louis Budenz. The record shows an amazing facility for remembering years later more than he could recall when he first left the Communist Party and became an FBI informant. New evidence cast new doubts upon him but his illness prevented his cross-examination. Judge Bazelon, dissenting in this new decision, thinks all Budenz's testimony should have been stricken, too.

As If Written by Gilbert and Sullivan

The majority on the Court of Appeals, Judges Prettyman and Danaher, confronted by ever diminishing evidence as more and more testimony is striken as unreliable, falls back on guilt by association. The majority says "guilt by association is a concept we will not even entertain for consideration, but this proceeding is not to determine guilt. It is to ascertain characteristics, and association is surely one of the best-known sources of information about characteristics." These words of Judge Prettyman's are worthy of Gilbert and Sullivan.

We may hear more on appeal to the Supreme Court about Point 1 of the decision. Prettyman and Danaher ordered the Subversive Activities Control Board three years ago to strike its findings on alleged Communist "secret practices" on the ground that it was not supported by "a preponderance of the evidence." The Board did not obey the Court's mandate to strike, though there is less evidence now. The majority says it thinks the Board is "entitled to adhere to its view on the point until our view of it has been tested in the Supreme Court." This seems pretty silly, too, and may prove grounds for reversal.

Going Off on Two Week Vacation—Next Issue Will Be That of August 31

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

8/10/59

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED